



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

evidently does so enjoy his Pindar, and seems to believe it possible for every properly trained classical scholar so to enjoy him. He says very reasonably: "... Pindar is essentially a writer of whom it may be said that *l'appétit vient en mangeant*. Those qualities in his style, which some describe as bombast and turgidity, are really splendid proofs of a keen instinct for style that enabled him always to maintain his poetic elevation, though dealing with events which, however glorified by associations, were in themselves not considerable". The essay contains an acute and interesting discussion of Mezger's theory of the construction of the Pindaric epinician odes. The value of the discussion would have been greatly enhanced by an appendix giving Tyrrell's own views of the work of Fraccaroli, Christ, Schroeder, and others; and it is hard to see how this, even though not contemplated in the original design, would have run counter to it.

The essay on Bacchylides is admirable, particularly when read in connection with that on Pindar. To read the two authors together in the original is hardly fair to Bacchylides. He loses, by contrast with his splendid rival, much of the merit that is undeniably his, just as the fertile and smiling valley seems tame to the eye that is still filled with the splendor of the snow-capped Alps.

Sophocles is very skilfully handled in the second essay, which is in large part a glorification of Jebb's monumental edition. In the course of it (p. 52) Dr. Tyrrell indulges in the most violent of the many flings—sometimes decidedly ill-natured, with which the book is peppered: "We are disposed to recommend an adjunct to the Decalogue for the guidance of our rising scholars. Thou shalt not covet the German's knife, nor his readings, nor his metres, nor his sense, nor his taste, nor anything that is his". Of course there is much to be said for the traditional English conservatism in textual matters, even though, as in religious matters, it is desperately afraid that any departure from tradition may be 'unsafe', and lead to exclusion from the everlasting peace of the saints. But it is too often forgotten that even the most venerable of traditions may stop a good deal short of the point to which it professes to reach back, and that proneness to error was quite as distinctly a human failing in the fourth century B. C. as it has been since. Still, one must believe in something; and the orthodox English belief that the *textus recepti* contain in the vast majority of cases word-for-word the productions of the classical authors is at least as reasonable as that of an individual German who is firmly convinced not only that the accepted text is full of mistakes but in particular that he alone knows how to set them right.

The essay *The New Papyri* is chiefly taken up with the papyrus Ms. containing the greater part of the Constitution of Athens generally accepted as

the work of Aristotle. Dr. Tyrrell gives an admirable summary of its contents, with running comments on the agreement of the data with the facts known, or at least assumed to be facts, from other sources. He refuses to accept the work as from Aristotle's pen, mainly on grounds of style—a very uncertain criterion in the case of a writer whose works cover so enormous a range as those of Aristotle and were produced for such various classes of hearers and readers.

The concluding essay, on Plutarch, brings much of great interest and value, but on the whole is disappointing. In fact, it may be said that any attempt to handle a topic of such magnitude in thirty 'crown octavo' pages is doomed to failure. There are many just and illuminating observations upon Plutarch in these pages; but one may easily fancy that great essayist himself, if he has an opportunity of reading them in the Elysian Fields, saying in the words of the infant in the epitaph:

Since I was so soon to be done for,

I wonder what I was begun for.

Yet it is somewhat remarkable when an English scholar goes so far away from the beaten track of the 'classical' authors. The disinclination of these scholars, as a body, to busy themselves with anything outside of this range is in none too honorable contrast with the eagerness of the wicked Germans to open up all paths of approach to an understanding of ancient civilization, and indeed with the attitude of English archaeologists, who are second to those of no nation in their quest of new ground. A reading of von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's admirable lecture on Greek Historical Writing<sup>1</sup>, delivered at Oxford in 1908, brings out very clearly the greater sweep and power and independence of the German *Geist* at its best. It is an endless pity that almost no Germans have ever learned to write so reasonable a style as that which has become a matter of course with English scholars; and Wilamowitz might be even better in French than he is in German.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. D. PERRY.

Studies in the Philosophical Terminology of Lucretius and Cicero. By Katherine C. Reiley. New York: The Columbia University Press (1909). Pp. ix + 133. \$1.25 net.

This valuable little volume, offered by the author as her dissertation for the doctor's degree, is divided into two parts. Part I, General View, comprises an introductory statement and four chapters severally entitled, The Employment of Greek Words, Prose and Poetic Diction, Prose and Metrical Form, Temperamental and Scholastic Influences. Part II, Studies of Special Groups of Terms, embraces three

<sup>1</sup> Beautifully translated by Professor Gilbert Murray, and published by the Clarendon Press. Only those who have tried Englishing any considerable portions of W.'s compact and forcible German can imagine the seriousness of the task.

chapters severally entitled, The Atoms, Void and Space, the Universe: the Infinity of Matter, of Void, and of Space. Appended is a bibliography of sources and secondary works and an index.

We have in this treatise a serious and dignified attempt to determine and set forth the contributions in the field of philosophical terminology made to the Latin language by the two great exponents of Roman thought, Cicero and Lucretius. In the General View the author states that

the scope of the comparison is narrower than we could wish, for Lucretius concerned himself chiefly with the mechanical and physical side of Epicureanism while Cicero, whose philosophical interests were largely ethical, passed over these elements in a rapid summary. When, however, the interests of the two thinkers touched, we see in full view, just as in the processes of a laboratory, their terminology in the very making.

In the philosophical works of Cicero the author finds 99 Greek words, and only 2 such words in Lucretius — *ἀπουσία*, *δυσιοιμέτεια*. 72 Greek terms found in Cicero have no counterpart in Lucretius and hence cannot form the basis of comparison. Of these, 38 are compound, 34 simple terms. Cicero turned 26 of the 34 simple terms into single Latin terms. For the remaining 8 he employed various Latin "devices". He turned only 15 of the 38 Greek compounds into single Latin terms. The remaining 23 he translated by various equivalents or not at all.

Examining the Greek terms latinized by both authors the writer finds that they each converted 16 into a single Latin equivalent and resorted to "various devices" to render 11 others, with about equal success.

Summarizing conclusions thus far the author states that "Cicero shows in general a greater wealth and facility of expression than Lucretius". Yet Cicero's "familiar hesitation between several terms has marred the technical rigor of his terminology".

With a passing remark that the diction of the two authors necessarily affected the terminology of each the writer groups together (page 26) a partial list of 51 words "found only in Lucretius and his imitators". To these a list of 9 "distinctly philosophical words" is added, making a total of 60. A list of 13 typical words occurring for the first time in the philosophical writings of Cicero is also given. This seems to show a marked tendency on the part of Cicero to use coined words only "in the interest of his philosophical terminology".

"Prose and metrical forms" also affected the choice of words. Many expressions available for Cicero must be modified or paraphrased by Lucretius. This restriction of poetic form determined the usage of many words philosophical, and non-philosophical (e. g. *arbusta* for *arbores*), so that we cannot ascribe to Cicero in the use of certain words a cleverness of expression or a depth of sympathetic feeling not found in Lucretius.

The temperament and training of the two men,

as the writer points out, must of necessity affect "the tenacity with which each seized and held a term". But if Lucretius is open to the charge of bigotry (page 30), surely Cicero, a dilettante in philosophy, pedantic in method and quite void of logical system, ought not thus to influence our judgment against a doctrine and its exponents about which he knew little and cared less. No doubt Lucretius's exalted opinion of Epicurus for what he had done to liberate the world from superstition accounts for many archaisms and studied peculiarities of the poet's style and terminology.

Turning now to part two we have the results of the writer's investigations "of special groups of words". In the examination of each group the author states the Epicurean usages, then points out and compares the usages respectively of Lucretius and Cicero, and follows each study with a brief but valuable summary. The investigation shows that only three words in the known Greek of Epicurus occur absolutely in the undoubted sense of 'atoms' namely, *ἄτομος*, *σπέρματα*, *σώματα* . . . Eleven terms in Lucretius are found with the sense of 'atoms' . . . Of these *corpora* and *semina* alone correspond to their Greek prototypes *σώματα* and *σπέρματα* . . . *Corpuscula* and *particulae* have no known Greek originals . . . Four words in the Latin of Cicero occur with the meaning of 'atoms', namely *atomi*, *individua*, *corpora*, *corpuscula*.

The controversy over the divisibility of the Epicurean atom still rages. The writer here takes a very reasonable view, leaving the meaning of *ἄγκυρα* undetermined. The divisible atom seems only a device to explain atom shapes. The *primordia* of Lucretius are *solida simplicitate* and can admit no void.

The atoms or molecules, though not susceptible of physical separation or dissection, are still composed of parts which can at least be distinguished from each other. The atom is *logically* divisible; for as it differs in the shape of each example, it must consist of not less than three parts—parts, however, which are only *mathematically* distinguishable by their different positions or order in the total which they constitute. (Lucr. II, 485). Between such *ideal* constituents of the atom there is no intervening void . . . And thus for all purposes of mechanical cosmogony, the complex molecules, formed by the union of these simple parts, may be treated as themselves simple and elementary (Wallace, *Epicureanism*, London, 1908, p. 177. The italics are the reviewer's).

In approaching the study of "void and space" the writer presents three possible views of the uses "made by Epicurus of the Greek terms *ἀναφής φύσις*, *κενόν*, *τόπος*, and *χώρα*": (a) Epicurus consistently used each of them in a technical sense, or (b) as exact synonyms, or (c) "by his use of the terms he distinguishes between void and space". The conclusion reached is that Epicurus did not "observe the distinctions of meaning assigned by Sextus" to these terms; that they were not used as exact synonyms, and that, though the evidence is scanty, the following distinctions prevail: *τόπος* = 'space', *κενόν* or *ἀναφής*

*φύσις* = 'void'. "*χώρα* has no technical meaning", Applying the same test to Lucretian usage the result reached is that the poet did not use *inane*, *vacuum*, *locus*, *spatium*, in a technical sense on the basis claimed by Sextus, and that Sextus must be wrong in claiming that they were so used; that Lucretius did not use the terms as exact synonyms, but with the following variations: *inane* = *inane purum*, 'void', usually, but *inane* qualified by *haec in quo sita sunt et qua diversa moventur* (1. 421), "alters the concept from void to space"; that *vacuum* as used by Lucretius involves no controversy as it is a non-technical term; that *locus* is used 82 times in a non-technical sense (*inane* 6 times), and 19 in a technical sense (*inane* 69 times); that *spatium* "is used as a variant of *locus* in the sense of space". Little attention is given to Ciceronian usage here since in treating of these concepts he failed "to develop a rigorous and definitive terminology".

The same method is followed in the examination of "the Universe". The Greek sources here are meager. Four terms appear: *τὸ πᾶν*, *τὸ ἀπειρον*, *ἀπειρία*, *τὸ πλεχρον*. The first of these is most definitive and signifies "the whole sum of matter and space". On Lucretius's use of *omne* the writer decides with the majority of critics that this term is equivalent to *τὸ πᾶν*, "the universe of matter and space". In this connection the author finds two groups of words in the terminology of Cicero indicating "the infinity of space, and the infinity of matter and space", . . . "neither of which is defined with perfect precision".

The whole study bears evidences of careful and painstaking research. The results are well attested in the prefatory note by Professor Peck: ". . . Dr. Reiley has examined the prevailing theories regarding certain technical terms that belong to the materialistic philosophy of Greece and Rome, and by an acute examination of the evidence, both ancient and modern, has arrived at conclusions which constitute a distinct contribution to knowledge".

ROBERT B. ENGLISH.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE.

### THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

The Fourth Annual Meeting will be held at THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, 138th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York City, on Friday and Saturday, April 22 and 23, 1910.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 22, at 2.30

Address of Welcome, by DR. JOHN H. FINLEY, President of the College of the City of New York.

A Programme of Reform for Secondary and Collegiate Instruction in Latin and Greek, by DR. BARCLAY W. BRADLEY, College of the City of New York.

Ends to be sought: knowledge (a) of universal principles of language, (b) of character as displayed in art forms. Intensive study is indispensable to the former, extensive reading to the latter. At present it is physically impossible for the average student to read enough in the original tongues to attain the latter end; study of classical works in English translations must therefore be introduced into the curriculum. Outline of a course planned to meet the two ends named above.

The Feeling for Nature in Horace's Poetry, by DR. ELIZABETH H. HAIGHT, Vassar College.

The paper will consider (a) the proper method of approach to an antiquity: the feeling for nature in other Roman poets; (b) Horace's feeling for nature: 1) his life in the country and its benefits, 2) his use of nature in mythological representation, figures, and description, 3) his sincerity as a lover of nature in spite of his own statements and the second Epode.

The Present Status of Latin Text Criticism, by PROFESSOR B. L. ULLMAN, University of Pittsburgh.

Advances in Text Criticism. Readings once chosen indiscriminately from all MSS. and editions. Introduction by Lachmann of policy of selection of certain MSS. Beginning by Baehrens and others of a thorough search for the best MSS. Present tendency to re-examine all MSS. and to make use of external as well as internal evidence. Exclusive use of internal evidence by careless and superficial workers responsible for the ridicule often heaped upon this important subject. Our opportunity.

What and Why in Greek and Latin Composition, by MR. A. L. HODGES, of the Wadleigh High School, New York City.

An argument that too much stress is laid on Greek and Latin composition in the schools.

Report of the Executive Committee; Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.

FRIDAY EVENING, APRIL 22, at 8.15

Greetings from The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, by PROFESSOR J. E. HARRY, University of Cincinnati.

Greetings from the Classical Association of New England, by DR. JAMES J. ROBINSON, The Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Connecticut.

The Scientific Knowledge of the Ancient Greeks and Romans, by PROFESSOR JOHN C. ROLFE, of the University of Pennsylvania.

SATURDAY MORNING, APRIL 23, at 9.30

The Classical Element in the Poetry of Thomas Gray, by PROFESSOR GRACE H. MACURDY, Vassar College.

A study of the classical originals of Gray's "Startling felicities".

Concerning Vocabulary and Parsing, by PROFESSOR HERBERT T. ARCHIBALD, of Baltimore.

A study of aids to the acquisition of a Greek vocabulary.

References to Painting and Literature in Plautus and Terence, by PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College.

Roman Law and Roman Literature, by DR. JAMES J. ROBINSON, The Hotchkiss School.

Studies in Euripides: Iphigenia in Tauris 15, 73, 97-100, by PROFESSOR J. E. HARRY, University of Cincinnati.

Classical Art in the Metropolitan Museum, by DR. EDWARD ROBINSON, of the Metropolitan Museum.

An account of what is being planned and done to encourage an interest in classical art in New York.

Election of Officers; General Business.

Luncheon at 1, for members of the Association and visitors, given by the College of the City of New York.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 23, at 2.15

Byways of Roman Verse, by MR. B. W. MITCHELL, Central High School, Philadelphia.

A glimpse of what is interesting, amusing and instructive in the Poetae Latini Minores.

The Main Points to be Stressed in Preparation for Entrance Examinations in Latin, by PROFESSOR NELSON G. McCREA, Columbia University.

The Work of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, by PROFESSOR WILLIAM KELLEY PRENTICE, Princeton University.

Roman Coins and Classical Study, by PROFESSOR GEORGE N. OLCOTT, of Columbia University (illustrated by the stereopticon).

The paper will indicate how coins throw an interesting side-light on every phase of Roman history, literature and life, and in particular how they may be used in illustrating the authors generally read in school and college.